

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9-15 and 18, 21 and 23 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, and 23 are independent. Claims 1, 9, 10, 11, and 23 are hereby amended. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification, specifically at Figures 7, 8, and 9 and on pages 9, 10, and 11. Changes to claims are not statements with respect to patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112 beyond the remarks herein. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

II. SUPPORT FOR THIS AMENDMENT

Citations to Figures and Specification locations are provided. However, such citations are provided merely as examples and are not intended to limit the interpretation of the claims or to evidence or create any estoppel.

As an example, support of the amendment can be found at paragraph [0052], which is reproduced below, of the Specification.

[0042] As shown in FIG. 2, a retrieval keyword 210 for retrieving the desired EPG data is input from a terminal (not shown) linked to the home server 200A (FIG. 1). The input retrieval keyword 210 is transferred to the dictionary database 300A via the search engine 220 as the input unit.

[0043] When receiving the retrieval keyword 210, the dictionary database 300A extracts keywords relevant to the retrieval keyword 210. For example, when the input retrieval keyword 210 is the name of a person, the dictionary database 300A refers to a person dictionary, and extracts, as relevant keywords 320 relevant to a person's name 310 corresponding to the retrieval keyword 210, a reading 321 of the person's name 310, a nickname/informal name 322 such as a widely known name, an alias 323, and a group 324 to which the person belongs. Full names, etc., are likely to be input using misused kanji characters. Accordingly, by storing, in advance, frequently misinput characters, etc., as possible misused characters 311 in the dictionary database 300A, the relevant keywords may be extracted after replacing an improper full name by the person's name 310 as a correct name.

[0044] The extracted relevant keywords 320 and the input retrieval keyword 210 are used to retrieve the desired program information 110 from the EPG data in the data server 100A (FIG. 1). In addition to the relevant keywords 320, by storing previously used retrieval keywords, and arranging the stored keywords in order of frequency of use, the retrieval speed may be increased.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 11, which was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph, is amended herein, obviating the rejection.

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 6, 7, 11-13, 15, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein, et al (hereinafter, merely “Schein”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,657 to Livowsky, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Livowsky”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,165,098 to Boyer, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Boyer”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,798,785 to Hendricks, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Hendricks”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,631,522 to Erdelyi, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Erdelyi”).

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein, Livowsky, and Boyer, and Hendricks, and Erdelyi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,523,302 to Brown, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Brown”)

Claims 10 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein, Livowsky, and Boyer, and Hendricks, and Erdelyi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,134,547 to Huxley, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Huxley”).

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein in view of Livowsky, and Boyer and Hendricks, and Erdelyi and further in view of U.S. Pre Grant Publication No. 2003/0014753 to Beach et al.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein in view of Hatakeyama, and Boyer and Hendricks, and Erdelyi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,428 to Lee et al.

IV. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

...extracting at least one additional keyword from a dictionary database as a function of the input retrieval keyword,

wherein, when the input retrieval keyword is received in the receiving step, the at least one additional keyword is extracted from the dictionary database as a function of the input retrieval keyword in the extracting step, and

wherein the dictionary database stores frequently misspelled words as possible misspelled words, and

wherein the at least one additional keyword may be extracted after replacing an improperly input keyword with a corrected keyword based on the stored frequently misspelled words (Emphasis Added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Schein, Hatakeyama, Boyer, Hendricks, and Erdelyi, taken alone or in combination, fail to suggest or render predictable extracting at least one additional keyword from a dictionary database as a function of the input retrieval keyword, wherein, when the input retrieval keyword is received in the receiving step, the at least one additional keyword is extracted from the dictionary database as a function of the input retrieval keyword in the extracting step, and wherein the dictionary database stores frequently misspelled words as possible misspelled words, and wherein the at least one additional keyword may be extracted after replacing an improperly input keyword with a corrected keyword based on the stored frequently misspelled words, as recited in claim 1.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Schein, Livowsky, Boyer, Hendricks, and Erdelyi, that would teach the above-identified features of claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 11 and 23 are patentable.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 11 and 23 are patentable.

V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

Because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as

acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By



Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
Russell P. Blaise
Reg. No. 66,567
(212) 588-0800